



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

names of persons engaged in teaching the Classics or friendly to the Classics will be welcomed by the Vice-Presidents and by the Secretary-Treasurer. Personal invitations to such individuals to join the Association will be of much service. The value of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY to teachers in school and College (on this point many letters, on file in the office of the Business Manager, give enthusiastic testimony) may be pointed out to possible members, and the value of a large Association may also be insisted on with profit.

C. K.

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE ODYSSEY

Among the many features which are being used with success in the teaching of Greek in the schools to-day there is one which, in the opinion of the writer, deserves greater attention. This is the study of literary architecture. In taking up any work of literature with a class the teacher will be well repaid for all the time which he spends, at least in his own preparation, on the study of structural principles. These include not only the framework of the building, which is the outline of the thought, and the relation of one part to another (for example, the relation of the speech to the narrative in history), but also the characteristic features of the literary edifice, and the success with which each fulfills its purpose. This study of structure is the more important in the case of a work which is the first of its kind, or has greatly influenced later literature. Hence the literary form of the *Anabasis*, which constitutes the first military memoirs which we possess, should receive careful attention; hence, also, since the Greek epic has influenced literature quite as much as the Greek temple has influenced architecture, we ought carefully to study its structure. It may not be altogether without value, therefore, to give the results of a structural examination of what may be termed, on the analogy of architecture, the porch of one of the great Greek epics, the first book of the *Odyssey*.

Homeric criticism has belittled the literary worth of this porch. Wilamowitz characterized it as "patch-work": Groeger (*Rheinisches Museum* 59 (1904). 7) thinks it a weak imitation of *Iliad* 24; and Croiset sums up the case for its disparagers by denying to its author "the creative vigor of a great genius". Fortunately, these criticisms need not lead the teacher of today to present half-heartedly to his pupils this first book of the most fascinating romance that can be placed before the boys and girls in the high school. For the tide of criticism is setting strongly in the other direction (see A. Shewan, *Class. Phil.* 7, 193 ff.). Even as long ago as 1898 Professor Gildersleeve wrote (*A. J. P.* 19, 346): "In taking beginners through Homer for the first time, I should be tempted to assume the Unitarian point of view". If the teacher does this, he will examine the book architecturally merely to see if it performs its functions

well or ill, in other words, to return to our figure, to see if this porch, no matter where its materials were found, when and by whom it was constructed, really is a good porch.

The first book of the Homeric epic performs much the same function as does the prologue of Attic tragedy. First, it fixes the attention on the theme of the poem: in the *Iliad* the *μῆνις* is prominent throughout the first book. Secondly, it describes the situation and introduces some of the more important characters. But there is this difference between epos and tragedy: the latter, like the oration of the Athenian law-court, which was the slave of the *kelpsydra*, must exclude all unessential matters and proceed directly toward its goal, while the epic takes a more leisurely course, and admits much extraneous material. Hence, thirdly, beside stating the theme and describing the situation and introducing the characters, the epic prologue must also have a certain degree of completeness. Considered architecturally, the porch of the epic edifice should not only suggest the purpose of the building and give some information by which we may more easily orient ourselves when we are within, but it should also afford us entertainment as we are passing through it.

Let us now examine the first book of the *Odyssey* to see how well it fulfills this three-fold purpose:

(1) It is the person and the character of Odysseus which give unity to the *Odyssey*. Its theme is really the *ἀνὴρ πολύτροπος*. Now the first book, in spite of the fact that as in many a modern drama the hero does not appear in the first act (in Molière's masterpiece, *Tartuffe* appears for the first time in the third act), is full of references to him. Of the 320 verses devoted to affairs at Ithaca about 190 refer to Odysseus. Telemachus is the first to catch sight of Athena-Mentes (113-115), because he is thinking of his father, and his eyes are unconsciously turned toward the door. Athena's conversation with Telemachus is composed largely of references to Odysseus. The entrance of Penelope (328 ff.) is motivated by her grief for her absent husband, and the Suitors' chief interest in the stranger is due to their fear that Odysseus may return. Odysseus, though absent, is present in the minds of all.

(2) The first book gives also a good exposition of the situation at the beginning of the action, and introduces most of the persons who are to take part in the final struggle. Telemachus, Penelope, the Suitors with their leaders—the insolent Antinous and the hypocritical Eurymachus—and even Laertes and Eurycleia are presented to us. The entrance of each is natural and in almost every case is connected with a reference to the absent Odysseus.

(3) There remains the third purpose, to form an entertaining episode complete in itself. In this respect the first book will bear comparison with almost any other in the poem. After the first 95 verses,

which are in a more general way introductory, we have an episode possessing a unity of its own and constructed much after the fashion of an Attic tragedy. The Suitors, with Phemius, form the chorus, and the *dramatis personae* are Athena-Mentes, Telemachus, Penelope, Antinous and Eurymachus, with Eurycleia as a mute.

The theme, which is the transformation of the boy Telemachus into a man, is introduced in a most subtle way: at the gathering of the gods Zeus, in referring to the fate of Aegisthus, quotes the very words of the warning which Hermes conveyed to him (40): "For from Orestes shall come vengeance for the son of Atreus, when he shall come to man's estate". Athena catches at the suggestion. As Orestes on becoming a man slew the slayer of his father, so shall Telemachus assist his father in the struggle at Ithaca. Hence she says: "But I will go to Ithaca that I may rouse Telemachus the more and put courage in his heart (88 f.)". That it was the mention of Orestes which suggested this plan to her is indicated by 298 ff. where, in her appeal to Telemachus to show himself a man, she says: "Art thou not aware of the fame which Orestes gained . . . by slaying his father's murderer? . . . thou, too, my friend, be valiant".

Let us examine the structure of this episode. Verses 96-143 form the Prologos, in which Athena in the guise of Mentes goes to Ithaca and is welcomed by Telemachus, who sets food before her. The next 12 verses (144-155) take the place of the Parodos: the Suitors enter, feast, and listen to the song of Phemius. The first Epeisodion (156-324) consists of the conversation between Athena and Telemachus. It is the longest part of the episode, and is generally regarded as prosaic. We shall return to it later. At its close Athena, having accomplished her purpose, takes her leave, and Telemachus, a boy no longer, joins the Suitors. The *Nóστος Αχαιῶν*, sung by Phemius, is equivalent to a Stasimon. In Epeisodion II (328-364) Penelope overhears the song, and being unable to endure the sad recollections which it awakens, descends from her upper room and tells the bard to change his lay. Telemachus asserts his manhood, and bids his mother in the future to recognize him as master in the house. In amazement she retires to her apartments. The Suitors' noisy comments on the beauty of the queen (365 f.) may be regarded as an embryonic Stasimon II. In Epeisodion III (367-420) Telemachus again asserts his manhood, first by objecting to the uproar of the Suitors, and by repeating his resolve to be master in the palace, and, secondly, by declaring his intention of protesting formally before the assembly on the morrow, against their abuse of the privileges of the suitor. The singing and the dancing of the Suitors (421 f.) correspond to Stasimon III. In the Exodos (423-444) the Suitors and Telemachus leave the hall

to go to their rest—Eurycleia accompanying Telemachus.

Here we have a complete episode, constructed like a drama, with Prologos, Parodos, three Epeisodia, three Stasima and Exodos. Not more than three actors speak in any one scene, and the choral parts—which, of course are only embryonic—have reference to the preceding Epeisodion: in the first, the *Nóστος Αχαιῶν* is suggested by Mentes's reference to the return of Odysseus: the second is a comment on the beauty of Penelope, who has just left the hall, and the dance and the song of the third are in response to the injunction of Telemachus to enjoy these in moderation.

The general structure of the plot is excellent. The theme of the poem—the absent Odysseus—and the theme of the episode are never forgotten, but are skilfully woven together: it is really the picture of the absent father, brought vividly before the mind of Telemachus by the tact of Athena, that brings to full bloom his budding manhood. Thus there is a two-fold unity, which is required because the episode is part of the poem.

The delineation of the character of Telemachus deserves attention. At first he is a mere boy—his old nurse still puts him to bed (428 ff.). He is well-bred, for he knows how to welcome a stranger, to give him food at once, and then to ask his name and errand (119 ff.) Somewhat impatient, like many another young man, he cannot wait for the end of the dinner, but as soon as the cloth is removed, as it were, he asks the conventional questions (169 ff.) which an older man, like Menelaus or Alcinöus, would have deferred till later. He is a lonely lad, who either spends his time in the fields (Od. 4. 639 f.), or sits moodily among the Suitors. Only the tact of an Athena can win the confidence and awaken the self-reliance and hopes of such a youth. And she does this most cleverly, by creating the impression that his father will surely return (194 f.) and delicately suggesting his resemblance to Odysseus (217); by taking no notice of his despondency except to prick him gently with the goad of reproach for his passive submission to the Suitors (229, "A man of good judgment would feel indignant at them"); and, finally, by describing most vividly (as an example to him) what Odysseus would do if he were there (255-266). After this she gives him the advice which has brought her to Ithaca (266-287), and caps this with another example, this time of Orestes, a young man of his own age in a similar situation. Then with consummate skill she stops at once, and without giving Telemachus time to offer objections brings the conversation to a close by taking her leave after the usual exchange of commonplaces (271-313).

At this point comes the climax of the episode (320-324): "In his heart she put courage and strength, and reminded him of his father still more than before.

This he marked, and his soul was filled with wonder, for it flashed over him his guest was a god". Without a moment's hesitation he turned towards the Suitors—no longer a child, *νηπιῖδας δ' ἔχων* (297), but *ἰσθθεὸς φῶς*, a godlike man.

It remains to test the newly acquired manhood. The first trial of the prince is the easier of the two through which the poet makes him pass—to assert his rights as a man before his mother. The economy of the episode, too, requires this, for Penelope's entrance motives the disturbance of the Suitors (365-366), which in turn is the occasion for the second assertion by Telemachus of his manhood. The Suitors do not notice the prince's change of bearing in the presence of his mother, for her beauty absorbs the attention of all. If, as the critics assert, this entrance of Penelope is but a replica of a similar scene in the twenty-first book, it is used here most fittingly. Like a similar scene in the *τεῖχοςκοπία* (Il. 3. 145-160), it is employed both to introduce the heroine and to indicate, without describing, her beauty and also in the economy of the plot.

Telemachus shows a greater degree of manhood in his words to the Suitors (368-380) as well as considerable shrewdness in his reply to Eurymachus (413-410). Verses 374-380 (= Od. 2. 139-145) were apparently introduced here to give completeness to the episode by emphasizing the change in the character of the prince. Their use here is an extreme case of interference with the unity of the poem as a whole for the benefit of the unity of the episode¹.

The action of the episode is now over. It remains to clear the scene, and send the audience home in a calm, and—since this episode is introductory to the story—also in an expectant frame of mind. The Suitors, as night falls, go to their lodgings, and Telemachus to his bed. It has been an epoch-making day in his life. What is more natural than that he should sit for a moment on the couch before retiring? As the old nurse shuts the door of his chamber after her Telemachus closes his eyes, not to sleep, but—as the poet doubtless hoped that each one of his listeners might do to some extent—to ponder in his mind the journey which the goddess had pointed out to him.

If the above analysis of Od. 1. 96-444 is sound, we may claim the acquittal of the poet on the charge of mediocrity which is implied in the epithets 'patch-worker' and 'imitator', for the following reasons: (1) he has stated his theme ingeniously, and worked it out with skill, deftly dividing his little drama into episodes each of which plays a definite part in the development of the plot; (2) he has secured unity by keeping our attention always fixed upon the theme,

the change in the character of Telemachus, and by producing a climax which is not unworthy of being compared with that of the Philoctetes (1222 ff.) which is concerned with a similar theme; (3) he has also made the episode contribute to the progress of the story without sacrificing any of its unity, by introducing most of the *dramatis personae*, and characterizing each, and by focusing our attention at the same time on the absent hero of the poem.

Furthermore, if our analysis is sound, we have found another instance of the debt which tragedy owes to the epic—not only for myth, vocabulary and many of its features, but also for its principles of structure. As the Athenian architects of the fifth century, while following chiefly Dorian models, yet owed much of their greatness to the lessons which they learned from the Ionians, so the tragic poets achieved greatness by working together the Ionian epic with the Dorian lyric. In the opinion of the writer, no debt of tragedy to Homer was greater than for the lessons which he taught in literary structure.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

SAMUEL ELIOT BASSETT.

REVIEW

The Religious Experience of the Roman People, from the Earliest Times to the Age of Augustus. By W. Warde Fowler. New York: The Macmillan Co. (1911). Pp. xviii + 504. \$4 net.

This volume consists of twenty lectures delivered in Edinburgh University in 1909-1910 on the foundation of Lord Gifford. As the title indicates, Mr. Fowler deals with the development and the decay of the religion of the Romans from the earliest period through the founding of the Empire, always keeping his mind fixed on religion as an experience rather than as a formal and ordered organization. The first half of the book is devoted to a discussion of the primitive elements, known only through their scanty survivals, family religion, the calendar, numina, ritual, and the foreign cults which came early to Rome. The second half takes up the historical development of religion under the new influences from abroad with the consequent conflicts and readjustments, the secularization of religion, the effects of the war with Hannibal, of Greek philosophy and of mysticism; and finally gives three interesting lectures to the religious feeling in Vergil, to the Augustan revival, and to those elements in Roman religion which concern Christianity.

From this rich and abundant program a reviewer can choose only a few points for notice. Mr. Fowler adopts as his definition of religion the words of one of our own countrymen, Professor Ira W. Howerth: "Religion is the effective desire to be in right relations to the Power manifesting itself in the universe". This statement the author makes the guiding thread of his exposition, as he traces religious experience and ritual acts from their ruder forms to the highest development to which they attained before the full tide from the East had profoundly affected the current of religion in the West.

In a survey of the relics of the earliest stages, Mr. Fowler in a single paragraph happily dismisses totem-

¹ A similar interference with the unity of the poem as a whole for the benefit of that of the episode may be seen in one of the most entertaining passages of the *Iliad*, 1. 570-600. Elsewhere in the *Iliad*, e. g. 24. 55-76, divinities wrangle without becoming reconciled, but in the first book the mediation of Hephaestus is needed to bring the Episode—and the day—to a peaceful close.